

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 29-46 as anticipated by Yoshimura '937. Claims 47-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Yoshimura in view of Haines '588.

Claim 29 distinguishes over Yoshimura at least in the following ways. First, claim 29 recites the display field providing a warning graphical symbol, and the display field being substantially shown in a second color given a potentially disturbed second operating state with a potential malfunction of a first group which has not yet occurred. The Examiner relies on Figure 14A showing the display screen of Yoshimura having a symbol A4 representing presence of sheets. The Examiner also relies on the disclosure that the back light of the LCD display screen shown in Fig. 14A and also at reference numeral 8 in Fig. 1 has its color changed to red given the occurrence of a trouble (column 30, line 25). Thus, for a given processing mode such as printing which is color C3 (yellow), this back light color changes from yellow during printing to red when a trouble occurs in the printing (see also column 30, lines 14-25). The Examiner is also relying on the disclosure at Fig. 20 where the back light display changes from a first color represented at step S612 to a display back light color represented at step S618 representing that a request is interrupting, and also changing the display back light as indicated at step S619 representing that a request cannot be accepted. This disclosure in Figure 20 is further explained in the specification at column 32, in the following manner. There it is disclosed when a processing portion that performs copying is unuseable at step S611, that is whether or not an interrupt of a copier processing is applicable to the current job (for example while the printer function is being used). This is determined based on the relationship shown in Table 4 at step S617. When the interrupt is possible, at step S618, the

current job is temporarily suspended and the back light color represents that an interrupt of a copier processing is possible. When the interrupt is impossible, at step S619 a back light representing that the copy mode cannot be accepted is displayed and the process is ended.

None of the above disclosures in combination in Yoshimura suggest the claim language of the display field providing a warning graphical symbol, and the display field being substantially shown in a second color given a potentially disturbed second operating state with a potential malfunction of a first group which has not yet occurred. Although the Examiner relies on the paper tray symbol, this symbol is not associated with the second color and also is not associated with a potential malfunction of a first group which has not yet occurred. Thus the claim language readily distinguishes.

Claim 29 further distinguishes at least by reciting the display field providing a malfunction graphical symbol different than the warning symbol, and the display field being substantially shown in a third color given a disturbed third operating state with a malfunction of a second group which already occurred. The paper display symbol relied on by the Examiner is not a malfunction graphical symbol different than a warning symbol. Furthermore, the presence of an interrupt, or no presence of an interrupt, has nothing to do with providing a malfunction graphical symbol different than the warning symbol and then an associated third color associated with the malfunction graphical symbol. Changing color based upon whether or not there is an interrupt does not in any way disclose a warning graphical symbol with an associated display field second color, and a malfunction graphical symbol different than the warning symbol and an associated display field third color. The claim thus readily distinguishes over Yoshimura.

Dependent claims 30-32 and 34 readily distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to independent claim 29 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent claim 37 distinguishes at least by reciting a warning graphical symbol and a malfunction graphical symbol different than the warning graphical symbol. Yoshimura only shows a symbol A4 representative of presence of sheets in a paper tray and in no way shows both a warning graphical symbol and a malfunction graphical symbol different than the warning graphical symbol.

Claim 37 further distinguishes by reciting the warning and malfunction graphical symbols being substantially shown in a first color, the warning graphical symbol being substantially shown in a second color and the malfunction graphical symbol being substantially shown in the first color given a potential disturbed second operating state with a potential malfunction which has not yet occurred, and the malfunction graphical symbol being substantially shown in a third color given a disturbed third operating state with a malfunction of the second group which has already actually occurred. The symbol representative of presence of paper sheets in Figure 14A in no way undergoes the color changes described in claim 37. Rather, in Figure 14A only the back light colors change from a printing color yellow to a trouble color red. But the symbol A4 does not change in color. Only the back light changes from yellow for printing to red for trouble. Claim 37 recites three colors whereas there are only two colors – namely yellow for printing and red for trouble in Figure 14A. Thus claim 37 also distinguishes in this fashion. Finally, claim 37 recites two different graphical symbols each of which changes colors. Nothing like this is present in Figure 14A of Yoshimura.

Independent claim 38 distinguishes in a manner similar to claim 37.

Independent claim 39 distinguishes at least by reciting a first graphical representation of at least one first view of the printing or copying system, with a graphical representation specifying a region in which an error has occurred. Applicants have been unable to find anything in Yoshimura illustrating the printing or copying system with the graphical representation specifying a region in which an error has occurred. The Examiner has not indicated which portion of Yoshimura the Examiner is relying on for claim 39, and it is believed that Yoshimura does not show anything with respect to claim 39. Claim 39 further recites at least one second graphical representation of at least one part in which a location of the area is shown enlarged. This enlarged second graphical representation could not be found anywhere in Yoshimura. The Examiner has not indicated where in Yoshimura this portion of claim 39 is found. Thus, claim 39 readily distinguishes.

Dependent claims 40-45 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 39 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent claim 46 distinguishes at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 39.


Independent claim 47 distinguishes at least by reciting that at least one error code is transmitted and the error code is associated with each of a plurality of possible error states and the occurred error state being identified with aid of the transferred error code. Although Haines does disclose an electronic message indicating status information to a scheduling engine, there is no disclosure of an error code and particularly no disclosure of an error code associated with each of a plurality of possible error states and the occurred error state being identified with aid of the transferred error code.

Dependent claims 48-54 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 47 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Method claim 56 distinguishes in a manner similar to claim 47.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg). #27,841

Brett A. Valiquet  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-258-5786  
Attorneys for Applicants  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

**The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Account No. 501519.**

CHI\5077666.1